

Saint Louis University School of Law Scholarship Commons

All Faculty Scholarship

2006

Open Access in Law Teaching: A New Approach to Legal Education

Matthew T. Bodie

Saint Louis University School of Law

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.law.slu.edu/faculty>

 Part of the [Intellectual Property Law Commons](#), and the [Legal Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bodie, Matthew T., Open Access in Law Teaching: A New Approach to Legal Education. *Lewis & Clark Law Review* (2006).

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Faculty Scholarship by an authorized administrator of Scholarship Commons. For more information, please contact erika.cohn@slu.edu, ingah.daviscrawford@slu.edu.

Symposium: Open Access Publishing and the Future of Legal Scholarship
Lewis & Clark Law School
March 10, 2006

OPEN ACCESS IN LAW TEACHING: A NEW APPROACH TO LEGAL EDUCATION

Matthew T. Bodie*

The “Open Access” movement has focused on freeing up access to research and scholarship, particularly in the fields of science and now law. As prices have risen for scientific journals and legal databases, more and more potential researchers are being shut out from the information they need. While the most alarming examples come from the world of medicine, where lives truly are at stake, access to legal periodicals may impact the ability of particular plaintiff to achieve a just result.¹ The efforts of the open access movement in law will shape the future contours of how the legal academy conducts its research. Access to scholarship will determine issues such as the type of databases that we go to for scholarship, the continued viability of law reviews, and even the nature of legal scholarship itself.

My contribution to this conference, however, is to shift the focus. The open access movement has the potential to craft even greater changes to another aspect of legal academia – namely, teaching. For most law professors, whose institutions give them ready access to the legal databases they need, open access may not have that much of an

* Associate Professor, Hofstra University School of Law; Visiting Associate Professor of Law, Saint Louis University School of Law, 2006-2007. Many thanks to Lydia Loren, Joe Miller, Dean Huffman, and the editors of the *Lewis & Clark Law Review* for hosting this symposium.

¹ See Michael W. Carroll, *The Movement for Open Access Law*, *Lewis & Clark L. Rev.* (forthcoming 2006) (discussing the development of enterprise liability from a student comment in the *Fordham Law Review*). But see Michael J. Madison, *Open Access and the Idea of the Law Review*, *Lewis & Clark L. Rev.* (forthcoming 2006) (“[Law reviews] aren’t supposed to help practicing lawyers solve their clients’ problems.”).

immediate impact on their scholarly pursuits. Open access in law teaching, however, has the potential to revolutionize our approach to the classroom. Casebooks, supplements, course coverage, feedback, and even the structure of law school itself could be completely overhauled by an open access approach. Ultimately, the classroom of the future may be as changed by open access as it was by the case method.

The following describes the ways in which an open access approach may change legal education. Part I briefly describes the basics of an open access approach. Part II discusses an open access approach to course materials. Part III discusses an open access approach to teaching practice and methodology. Finally, Part IV talks about how open access could change the nature and structure of legal education itself.

Part I: The Open Access Approach

I begin with a brief discussion of what “open access” would mean in the context of legal education. Open access in my view means three things: (1) free electronic access to the materials, (2) the chance for individuals to access, copy, and even change the materials in electronic form, and (3) the chance to collaborate with others outside the constraints of a commercial and/or copyright-protected regime.² These three facets are what make the open access approach so attractive, and they are necessary to produce the benefits of an open-access approach. These benefits are discussed below.

Open access would facilitate exchange. One of the most important features of open access is the increased exchange of ideas. We have already seen the benefits to legal scholarship from the free electronic access to working papers through bepress and

SSRN.³ Both the “free” and the “electronic” aspects of this accessibility are critical. Free access means access for those who cannot pay, or those who would have to incur substantial transaction costs in paying (such as seeking later reimbursement). Electronic access may be even more important, however, as it reduces the transaction costs in retrieving the information and provides near instantaneous availability. A trial transcript may be free to members of the public, but few are likely to see it if they have to pick it up at the court clerk’s office, and it will probably take a while to get there in hard copy. Electronic access is necessary in order to take advantage of new technologies.

Open access would facilitate individualization. When it comes to open access for scholarship, the ability to alter or change the underlying materials is less relevant. Word processing software may make it easy to incorporate electronic research into your own articles by cutting and pasting, but this is a relatively minor convenience. However, when it comes to course materials, manipulation of the materials is essential in allowing individual professors to craft their own approach. If I and my students had free access to a set of hard-cover casebooks, my students would be saved the expense but I would still be stuck with that set of materials. However, if the casebook came in an electronic form that I could edit to suit my own needs, it would provide for much more individualization. As discussed below, this level of flexibility would unleash creativity and provide professors with the ability to more finely tune their courses.

Open access would facilitate new technologies. Given free access to editable materials that are not restricted by a commercial relationship, new technologies will

² In previous work, I used the term “open source” to describe such an approach. See Matthew T. Bodie, *The Future of the Casebook: An Argument for an Open-Source Approach*, J. Leg. Educ. (forthcoming 2006), also available at: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=691985.

develop to best exploit those materials. Commercial or intellectual property restrictions, on the other hand, will impede this development. As I described in my article about open-source casebooks, contractual and copyright concerns create real difficulties for the open-source model, regardless of the benefits that such casebooks may bring.⁴ Ironically, most of the materials in casebooks are either non-copyright-protected government documents or copyright-protected scholarly articles which the authors would love to see in a casebook. But the layer of copyright and contractual defenses around the electronic versions of these materials creates a significant hurdle for any casebook project. This is just one example. New technologies would allow professors to use legal materials like never before, if only access restrictions could be cleared out of the way. An open access approach would insure that new technologies could be used to their best advantage, rather than trying to shoehorn new technologies into existing legal and commercial regimes.

Part II: Open Access and Course Materials

In beginning a discussion of course materials, we should first delineate what “course materials” actually are. The centerpiece of law school course materials is the casebook. However, there are also a variety of other published materials that may be assigned by the professor or that students may purchase to assist them in their studies. Such materials may include statutory supplements, hornbooks, commercial outlines, edited volumes (such as Foundation Press’s “Foundations of . . .” series),⁵ and practice materials. In addition, there are a growing number of non-print resources: PowerPoint

³ See Lawrence B. Solum, *Download It While It’s Hot: Open Access, Intermediaries, and the Dissemination of Legal Scholarship*, Lewis & Clark L. Rev. (forthcoming 2006).

⁴ Bodie, *supra* note MTB1.

⁵ See, e.g., FOUNDATIONS OF CORPORATE LAW (Roberta Romano ed., 1993).

slides, computer programs with lessons and exercises,⁶ videos, and blogs.⁷ The PC and Internet revolutions continue to provide new ways of delivering content to professors and students, and by the time this article appears there will likely be even more.

There is much to like about the current state of legal course materials. Professors have a plethora of casebooks from which to choose. The casebooks are generally written by talented and insightful professors, carefully edited by legal publishers, and updated frequently with supplements and new editions. Students also have a wide variety of supplements from which to choose, from traditional hornbooks to CALI exercises. Professors can also add new materials fairly easily, either by photocopying or by posting an electronic copy on a class website. In fact, the new world of websites such as TWEN or Lexis/Nexis web course pages offers an even easier and quicker level of access to class materials. Widespread use of electronic casebooks might not be too far down the road.

However, the current system also imposes legal and procedural barriers. Casebooks, hornbooks, statutory supplements, and commercial outlines all have copyright protection. In their bound and published form, such materials cannot be edited, other than the crude method of skipping some pages and adding in other materials. Even if such materials become electronically accessible, it is not clear that they will be produced in editable form.⁸ Thus, professors are stuck with choosing one of a variety of competing visions, rather than having the ability to alter an existing form to better suit one's pedagogical preferences. And as in the world of scientific publishing, there are more and more concerns about the cost of legal classroom materials. Casebooks have

⁶ See, e.g., The Center for Computer-Assisted Legal Instruction, CALI Lessons Home, *available at*: <http://www2.cali.org/index.php?fuseaction=lessons.home>.

⁷ See, e.g., Lawrence B. Solum, Legal Theory Lexicon, *available at*: <http://legaltheorylexicon.blogspot.com/>.

crept close to, and in some cases over, \$100, and casebook authors have become concerned about the costs imposed on students.⁹

An open access approach to classroom materials would bring greater flexibility and individuality to class materials while greatly expanding the potential sources for such materials. Under an open access system, professors would be free to use, edit, and agglomerate class materials however they saw fit. If such materials were not copyright-protected, were in electronically editable formats, and were distributed on the web, we would open up the capacity for professors to create individualized materials while at the same time receiving an extraordinary amount of feedback from other professors about those materials.

In my prior article on casebooks, I described how such a system might work.¹⁰ Essentially, creators of an open-source casebook would create a database with all of the individual “components” of a casebook. The database would contain editable files with cases, statutes, regulations, model codes, restatements, case notes, problems, and pieces of explanatory text. Professors could then pick and choose their materials and assemble them into a package for the course. Along with the individual components, the database could also allow individual professors to upload their own final compilations, either whole or in sections, to give other professors a starting point for their own casebooks. As more and more professors contributed materials to the database, ultimately it would contain all the materials a professor could want (updated daily by users).

⁸ For example, electronic casebooks could arrive in .pdf form, which is generally not editable by the reader.

⁹ Ian Ayers, “Just What the Professor Ordered,” N.Y. Times, Sept. 16, 2005, at A27.

¹⁰ Bodie, *supra* note MTB1.

Such open-source casebook projects would not need to be limited to the materials traditionally found in casebooks.¹¹ As constituted, casebooks are a mélange of primary and secondary sources: cases, statutes, regulations, Restatements, commentary, problems, case notes, and snippets from books and law reviews. By putting the casebook into electronic form, an even greater variety of materials could be put into the course's "casebook." Professors could post PowerPoint slides, audio clips, or even videos as part of the course's set of materials. Moreover, an open access approach would facilitate greater incorporation of primary materials into law school courses. Once casebooks had been deconstructed into their (electronic) components, it would be simple to add the latest complaint that had been filed in a high-profile case, or even link to court transcripts and evidence. In the federal prosecutions of Enron executives Kenneth Lay and Jeffrey Skilling, the government created a website with press releases and trial exhibits in .pdf form.¹² It would be easy to add certain exhibits to the electronic casebook, even during the course of the semester, in a way that is more cumbersome when dealing with a set of hard-copy course materials.

Of course, legal publishers could adopt an electronic format for their casebooks, which would allow for many of the improvements discussed above. Moreover, three of the biggest casebook publishing houses are owned by the companies that also own one of the two legal database providers, making integration of online electronic materials even easier.¹³ What benefits would an open access approach bring?

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² U.S. Dep't of Justice, Enron Trial Exhibits and Releases, *available at*: <http://www.usdoj.gov/enron/index.html>

¹³ Foundation Press and West Group are owned by Thomson West, which also owns the Westlaw database. Lexis/Nexis Publishing is owned by Reed Elsevier, which also owns the Lexis/Nexis database.

As discussed in part I, open access has three advantages over the traditional publishers' approach. First, open access would facilitate exchange. Free access to legal materials would enable professors, administrators, editors, lawyers, and even students to develop a variety of different projects that could be used in developing course materials for law students. The flexibility inherent in constructing a casebook project allows for a wide variety of perspectives. However, if electronic casebooks remain the province of legal publishers, top-down projects will remain the norm. It will be harder to exchange within these closed systems, both because the systems will be controlled by publishers and because the materials will be protected by copyright. Under an open access system, participants can freely exchange all the different course components through any system they can create.

Second, open access will foster greater individualization. Publishers need to establish some framework for the course materials in order to sell their product, and they are more likely to rely on their already-established frameworks in developing new approaches. Thus far, many electronic course materials have simply been existing casebooks which have been put online or onto CD-ROMs.¹⁴ Open access would allow for greater individualization as to the approach a particular professor wanted to follow. Professors could start with an existing approach and modify it, or they could start from scratch.

Third, open access would allow for speedier adoption of new technologies. Rather than waiting for one of the publishers to take and develop the new technologies,

¹⁴ Some professors have taken steps to create new online resources for their casebooks. *See, e.g.*, Foundation Press, Web Page for Business Associations: Agency, Partnerships and Corporations, 6th Edition, *available at*: <http://www.business-associations.com> (web resources for STEPHEN M. BAINBRIDGE, J. MARK RAMSEYER & WILLIAM A. KLEIN, BUSINESS ASSOCIATIONS (6th ed. 2003)).

tech-savvy professors – working with IT departments, open-source resources, or open-access centers¹⁵ – could develop their own materials for dissemination across the Internet. Given the success of law professor blogs, largely independent of any commercial or institutional facilitation, there is reason to think that independent producers would act more quickly in developing new approaches.

There are three primary concerns about an open-source or open-access approach to course materials: lack of motivation, lack of manageability, and copyright concerns.¹⁶ First, law professors may lack the motivation to contribute to an open-access project, since there would be no remuneration for such work. For many casebook authors, however, money is not the motivating factor behind their casebook. Instead, what they really want is to develop their own materials and then share them with the rest of the academic community. The open-access approach would facilitate this. As other open-source projects have demonstrated, volunteers are willing to contribute their time if they can do it in small pieces, those pieces are easily integrated with other pieces, and the contributors then benefit from the project as a whole.¹⁷ Open-access course material projects would fit well within this model.¹⁸

Second, an open-source casebook project may prove too successful for its own good. Manageability is a real issue: no one wants to have to wade through 100 edited versions of *Pennoyer v. Neff* in developing one's own civil procedure materials. However, with proper database management, professors would be able to navigate through the materials and even pass on their thoughts about what materials were most

¹⁵ The potential for nationwide “open-access centers” focused on particular subject areas or pedagogical approaches is discussed further in Part IV.

¹⁶ See Bodie, *supra* note MTB.

useful. In that way, the project could take in enormous amounts of content while providing some context for users to follow.¹⁹ Third, copyright and related contractual concerns present real difficulties for an open-access approach.²⁰ However, at this conference at least, we can assume away such concerns by stipulating the adoption of open access principles.

The benefits of an open access approach go beyond course materials for existing courses. Perhaps even more importantly, open access would allow for the creation of new courses much more easily and effectively. If a professor proposes a new course, he or she has tremendous start-up costs in assembling the materials for the course. Instead of managing such a project individually, professors could use an open access approach to collaborate with other professors across the country. Even if only a handful of professors participated, there would still be significant reductions in professorial time and effort, as well as informational gains from the expanded pool of knowledge applied to the task.²¹

There is a glimpse of the open access approach to new course materials in the set of materials for the “Deals” course that can currently be found on the web. Officially called “Deals: The Economic Structure of Transactions and Contracting,” the course is the central component of the Transactional Studies Program at Columbia Law School.

As described by Victor Fleischer, at the time the inaugural Research Fellow in

¹⁷ See Yochai Benkler, *Coase's Penguin, or, Linux and the Nature of the Firm*, 112 Yale L.J. 369, 435 (2002).

¹⁸ See Bodie, *supra* MTB1.

¹⁹ See *id.*

²⁰ Obviously, copyright protections limit the use of law review articles, restatements, and other commentary. Copyright does not protect government documents such as cases, statutes and regulations; however, Westlaw and Lexis/Nexis reportedly have contractual protections which prevent users from taking electronic versions of government documents off the database for their own use. See Bodie, *supra* note MTB1.

²¹ See, e.g., John E. Dunsford, *In Praise of Casebooks (A Personal Reminiscence)*, 44 St. Louis U. L.J. 821,825-28 (2000) (discussing the efforts of the Labor Law Group in developing collaborative casebooks).

Transactional Studies at Columbia,²² the Deals course is quite different than other law school classes in that it seeks to teach actual transactional skills using fact-intensive case studies. The first part of the course teaches students the theoretical tools necessary to evaluate contractual regimes, such as transaction costs, risk sharing, property rights, and finance.²³ The second part of the course asks students to apply these concepts to actual cases. Students are asked to present the cases to class, paying particular attention to the deal structure. Then attorneys who worked on the deal attend the following class session to discuss their thinking behind the transaction.²⁴ In a related course called the Deals Workshop, students are given a particular transactional problem and then asked to work together to develop a contractual solution. Examples of particular problems include a sale of a coffee shop business, an investment in a service firm that rates securities analysts, a music industry recording contract, and a venture capital financing.²⁵

These innovative approaches to teaching transactional skills are very labor-intensive, particularly to start up. Professors must develop their own materials essentially from scratch, given the dearth of teaching materials currently provided by the law publishing market. However, Fleischer's article provides a blueprint for professors or schools interested in developing their own Deals curriculum. Available for free on the Social Science Research Network (SSRN),²⁶ Fleischer's article has been downloaded

²² Victor Fleischer, *Deals: Bringing Corporate Transactions into the Law School Classroom*, 2002 Colum. Bus. L. Rev. 475. The paper is also available for free on the Social Science Research Network (SSRN) at: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=305340. Fleischer is now an Acting Professor of Law at UCLA School of Law.

²³ *See id.* at 491.

²⁴ *Id.* at 492.

²⁵ *Id.*

²⁶ SSRN, available at: <http://www.ssrn.com>.

almost a thousand times.²⁷ In addition, Fleischer himself has contributed three case studies that could be used in a deals-oriented course. One concerns a transaction between a medical fund and a venture capital group; the case study includes a memo for students, a memo for teachers, and a sample term sheet.²⁸ The second concerns a start-up company choosing between two forms of financing,²⁹ while the third is a case study of the Google IPO.³⁰ Other professors have also contributed case studies based on transactions studied in “Deals” courses.³¹ SSRN has served to facilitate the availability of these case studies for academics and students in an open-access manner.

The materials on “Deals” represent only the beginning of what an open-access approach can do.³² As open access makes it easier to create new courses, it would facilitate changes in the coverage of existing courses or even efforts to completely alter the law school curriculum. Under new dean Edward L. Rubin, Vanderbilt University Law School is undertaking a complete overhaul of its curriculum, including first-year courses.³³ Such an overhaul would be significantly easier if professors set their course materials using an open-access approach. Instead of having to develop an entirely new

²⁷ See Victor Fleischer, Deals: Bringing Corporate Transactions into the Law School Classroom, *at*: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=305340 (downloads as of July 14, 2006).

²⁸ Victor Fleischer & Geoffrey W. Smith, Columbia Venture Partners – Medtech, Inc., June 2003, *available at*: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=417520.

²⁹ Victor Fleischer, Streetwatch, May 2003, *available at*: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=407140.

³⁰ Victor Fleischer, Branding the Google IPO (Teaching Case), Feb. 7, 2006, *available at*: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=881607.

³¹ See, e.g., David Millstone & Guhan Subramanian, Oracle v. PeopleSoft: A Case Study, Oct. 12, 2005, *available at*: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=816006.

³² Another fascinating project is being headed up by Professors James Fanto and Lawrence Solan. They are creating a new course entitled “The Business Firm as Social Entity” and putting many of the materials online. They intend the course to be usable in law schools, business schools, and social science graduate departments. An electronic version of the course materials can be found at the website for the Center for the Study of Law, Language, and Cognition at Brooklyn Law School, *available at*: <http://www.brooklaw.edu/centers/cognition>.

³³ See Grace Renshaw, *A Memorable Year: The Launch of a New Ph.D Program is Just One of Dean Edward Rubin’s First-Year Accomplishments*, VANDERBILT LAWYER, Summer 2006, *available at*: http://law.vanderbilt.edu/alumni/lawyer/V35N2/memorable_year.html.

set of casebooks, professors would merely have to establish new databases, move materials from existing courses into those databases, and then add new materials using open-access methods.³⁴ An open-access process would make the changes significantly easier and would allow other schools to join in on the reforms.

Part III. Open Access and Law School Pedagogy

The traditional law school class provides students with only two forms of feedback. The first comes in class, as students are quizzed about the facts, holdings, and ramifications of different cases. As students respond in a back-and-forth with the professor, they gain insights into how to approach a case and how to apply those cases to new hypothetical situations. The second form of feedback comes through the grade on the final exam.

Law students often bemoan the lack of feedback in their classes. First-year students in particular often find themselves at sea in the first semester, wondering whether their preparations are leading them in the right direction. Many professors have taken steps to improve feedback by providing for practice exams, midterms, and/or open office hours to answer student questions about the material. But with classes of over 100 students, professors may not have the time to provide the level of feedback they aspire to.

New tools may change this.³⁵ Discussion boards and class blogs allow for professors and students to keep the conversation going outside of the class room.³⁶

³⁴ A school could limit access to these databases to its own professors, or it could open up its process to contributions from across the academy. A more open process would not only lead to richer materials, it would also enable other schools to follow, leading to more sweeping changes across the academy.

³⁵ See, e.g., Paul L. Caron & Rafael Gely, *Taking Back the Classroom: Using Technology to Foster Active Student Learning*, 54 J. Legal Educ. 551, 560-69 (2004) (describing the Classroom Performance System, a new technology involving handheld devices for classroom use).

Discussion boards serve to expand the access to particular questions and answers. Instead of merely talking to one or two students about the answer to a question, professors can provide answers that serve as a resource for the entire class. Blogs are similar to discussion boards but are often used for short discussions or for links to relevant outside materials of current interest. The professor may ask to students to post blog entries as part of the course requirements and may provide feedback on the posts as well. In some cases even outsiders can post their thoughts on the blog, providing another avenue for feedback.

Of course, blogs – like other technologies – could be used outside an open access approach. What would open access mean in this area? The same principles would apply: free access, individualized content, and collaboration without commercial or copyright barriers. Thus, an open access class blog would be freely accessible, would allow for individuals to take content off the blog and use for their own purposes (with attribution), and would allow professors and students to cross-fertilize with each other. For example, instead of simply having a closed class discussion board on a legal publisher’s website, an open access approach would counsel for blogs that are widely accessible and allow for students and professors across the country to participate. Allowing the technology to develop without the need to fit within a certain commercial product line would allow for greater creativity. Perhaps blogs will begin to bleed into one another, with participants in one Contracts class blog jumping over to participate in another. Some of these interactions may be planned by professors, while others may start at the student level.

³⁶ For some examples of class blogs, see Lawrence Solum, *Copyfutures*, *at*: <http://solum.typepad.com/copyfutures/>; Lydia Loren, *LC Cyberlaw*, *at*: <http://lawlib.lclark.edu/blog/cyberlaw/>; Ed Lee, *ip + internet*, *at*: <http://ipinternet.blogspot.com/>. Mike Madison has posted on the phenomenon of law school blogs at *Madisonian.net*. See Michael Madison,

Ultimately, we could see nationwide student blogs devoted to puzzling over the intricacies of various legal doctrines. In effect, nationwide “study groups” could provide another avenue for the eager student to get feedback. An open access environment is necessary, however, for such collaborations to flourish.

Professors could also pursue an open access approach to exams. While some professors’ exams are available on the web, there is no national repository of such exams, and many are accessible only to students at that school. An open access approach would counsel free access to these exams. By expanding the pool of available exams, professors would give students more opportunities for practice. Students could use web-based study groups to work on past exams and develop answers, which could then be bounced off other students for feedback. Professors would also benefit from the greater number of sample exams from which to draw. The exams could even be studied to determine what professors are actually teaching in their courses, and whether the exams they are using are the best tools for testing that knowledge. A nationwide pool of exams would be an invaluable resource for professors, students, and administrators. An open access approach would insure that the exams were freely available for all those who wish to use them.³⁷

Faculty can also better manage their own pedagogical effectiveness through an open source approach. Law school professors generally enter academia without any particularized educational or pedagogical training. Often, the only guide for a new

Law Teaching and Social Software, madisonian.net, at: <http://madisonian.net/archives/2006/01/22/law-teaching-and-social-software/>.

³⁷ Although outside the provenance of law schools, the administration of the bar exam would also benefit from an open access approach. Students would be better able to understand what the bar was looking for if the exam administrators more regularly offered prior exams, as well as answer keys showing what the exam graders were looking for. Such an approach would demystify the exam, help students and law schools

professor is his or her own law school experiences. Expanding the pool of available mentors for professors junior as well as senior would be possible through an open access approach to pedagogy. Professors could form “study groups” of their own to work on different teaching questions, such as Socratic questioning methods or effective hypotheticals.³⁸ In addition, professors have been forced into a world of open access student feedback through websites like Rate My Professors.³⁹ Although faculty may object to the open access and anonymity of the feedback, sites like Rate My Professors do allow for a wider range of feedback – to both professors and students – about the quality of a professor’s teaching. Rather than fighting such sites, professors should co-opt them by allowing for more detailed feedback on their own sites and by openly addressing students concerns.⁴⁰

Open access does not mean anything goes. Strong website managers will be needed to facilitate discussions and ensure that readers are not swamped in a morass of content. Filters and software structure are important in directing readers to the most useful information. Privacy concerns may also counsel that certain discussions on sensitive topics be kept within a closed zone.⁴¹ But particularly at the beginning, an open access approach will offer the best environment for the creativity and flexibility necessary to develop these new methods of interaction. And they may ultimately lead to

better prepare for the exam, and foster more discussion about the purpose and effectiveness of the exam itself.

³⁸ Subject-oriented listservs are an example of technological uses that address classroom questions.

³⁹ See Rate My Professors, *available at*: <http://www.RateMyProfessors.com>.

⁴⁰ Of course, anonymous sites like Rate My Professors may suffer from abuse at the hands of those with a vendetta. But professors should be open to the possibility for constructive feedback as well, and should work with students to channel such feedback into meaningful discussions.

⁴¹ See, e.g., Avi Salzman, “Symposium Guest’s Word Stirs Controversy at Yale,” N.Y Times, March 8, 2006, at BX (discussing a forum at Yale Law School on racism which was closed to outsiders).

a completely changed law school environment: one in which the borders between students, professors, and schools become ever more porous.

Part IV. Open Access and Legal Education

A. Michael Fromkin's "Nightmare" Vision

In 2000 at the AALS conference Michael Fromkin presented a new model for the law school based on the sweeping technological changes of the late 1990s. His presentation is preserved as a series of PowerPoint slides available on his website.⁴² Although only a skeletal version of his presentation, the slides are sufficient to describe what for most law schools and law professors would be a nightmare vision of the future.

Fromkin's presentation is entitled "The Virtual Law School? Or, How the Internet Will De-Skill the Professoriate, and Turn Your Law School into a Conference Center." Fromkin notes that law teaching is a business,⁴³ and that the business is experiencing several problems, such as rising tuition and complaints about the quality of education provided.⁴⁴ Distance learning through classes conducted via the Internet may provide a solution to some of these problems. Although creating such courses may entail high fixed costs to develop, once the course is developed students can be added at a very low marginal cost.⁴⁵ Thus, the law school model would be significantly altered; instead of classes as large as the lecture hall, classes could have hundreds or even thousands of participants.

⁴² Fromkin's homepage is available at: <http://www.law.tm/>. The slideshow, which he describes as "An only slightly tongue-in-cheek set of PowerPoint slides on The Virtual Law School," is available at: <http://personal.law.miami.edu/%7Efromkin/articles/aals/sld001.htm>. The table of contents is available at: <http://personal.law.miami.edu/%7Efromkin/articles/aals/index.htm>.

⁴³ *Id.* at <http://personal.law.miami.edu/%7Efromkin/articles/aals/sld003.htm>.

⁴⁴ *Id.* at <http://personal.law.miami.edu/%7Efromkin/articles/aals/sld004.htm>.

Given this new model, Froomkin predicts that there will be a premium placed on “superstar” teachers – namely, those who are particularly effective at conveying the course material.⁴⁶ Schools with prestigious brand names will also be at an advantage in selling distance-learning course packages.⁴⁷ Given their ability to leverage their own name and educational programs over a much larger pool of students, elite schools will dominate the market.⁴⁸ Low-cost upstarts will also succeed with low tuition prices and minimalist campuses.⁴⁹ State schools may also survive if they get the necessary funding to keep tuition lower while developing their own brands.⁵⁰ However, Froomkin predicts that private law schools in the middle of the pack will be the real losers, as their market for students is eroded from above and below.⁵¹ As a result, the need for professors will sharply decline. As traditional law school courses are replaced with virtual ones, famous professors or “super adjuncts” will be in demand to conduct those courses.⁵² Law schools will no longer need professors to fill every course. Grading could be outsourced to instructors who work for the school or who work for independent grading contractors. The law school as we know it will largely cease to exist.

Froomkin acknowledges that his vision of the future is only a vision at present. Current ABA regulations would not allow for an entirely virtual J.D. program. However, he posits that the ABA will not be able to stand in the way for too long.⁵³ Ultimately, law schools could become a completely virtual experience, one without the need for

⁴⁵ *Id.* at <http://personal.law.miami.edu/%7Efroomkin/articles/aals/sld013.htm>, <http://personal.law.miami.edu/%7Efroomkin/articles/aals/sld014.htm>.

⁴⁶ *Id.* at <http://personal.law.miami.edu/%7Efroomkin/articles/aals/sld017.htm>.

⁴⁷ *Id.* at <http://personal.law.miami.edu/%7Efroomkin/articles/aals/sld018.htm>.

⁴⁸ *Id.* at <http://personal.law.miami.edu/%7Efroomkin/articles/aals/sld025.htm>

⁴⁹ *Id.* at <http://personal.law.miami.edu/%7Efroomkin/articles/aals/sld026.htm>

⁵⁰ *Id.* at <http://personal.law.miami.edu/%7Efroomkin/articles/aals/sld027.htm>

⁵¹ *Id.* at <http://personal.law.miami.edu/%7Efroomkin/articles/aals/sld028.htm>

⁵² *Id.* at <http://personal.law.miami.edu/%7Efroomkin/articles/aals/sld029.htm>

buildings, classrooms, or a cadre of professors. Instead, all students will be able choose from a wide variety of courses from a small group of nationally prominent professors who can demand large sums for their superstar status.

B. An Alternative: the Open Access Law School

Froomkin's vision for the virtual law school of the future is a top-down model in which a handful of elite schools and professors dominate and the rest are put out of business. However, I'd like to posit a different vision of the future: one in which law schools and their faculty remain integral to the learning process despite the continued change in technology. In my vision of the "open access" law school, technology fosters greater collaboration rather than crushing it. Rather than eliminating the need for professors, technology may even heighten their role. An open access approach would create a more flexible, outwardly focused school and student body, but it would not replace the need for the individualized attention, instruction, and direction that law schools and law professors provide.

Take, for example, the virtual course. Schools could replace law school lectures with video presentations and allow students to submit their work and even exams over the Internet. But such a course would have even less feedback than the traditional law school course, which provides in-class feedback through the Socratic method. Moreover, there would be no stopping by to chat after class, no office hours, no human interaction. Perhaps law schools could manage discussion board or email interactions by outsourcing such responsibilities to adjuncts or teaching assistants, but the quality of the feedback would not be the same. Feedback on exams would be less instructive as well; mass

⁵³ *Id.* at <http://personal.law.miami.edu/%7Efroomkin/articles/aals/sld010.htm>.

production of grading would presumably hurt quality, and there would be no opportunity to meet with the professor to go over the exam.

Instead of replacing the current system with a mass-produced virtual substitute, law schools could use open access principles to enhance the current system. Online discussion boards and study groups would broaden the opportunities for feedback but would also require more input from professors. If interaction is to happen on a national level, professors still need to be there in order to provide instruction and guidance. A purely student discussion group has its benefits, but a discussion group with students and professors takes the education to another level. True collaboration needs professorial involvement. Open access facilitates the collaboration; it by no means eliminates the need for professors.

Open access would also facilitate a new approach to the law school curriculum. Fromkin's model envisions law school entrepreneurs who market their classes from the top down. An open access approach would allow new approaches to bubble up from the bottom. Professors who have a new class in mind could collaborate on the materials from across the country – with professors in a range of disciplines. Open access would allow all levels of participation, from managing the website to merely making a comment about potential course topics. Professors could share their collective wisdom while still retaining the flexibility to use their own individual approach. Similar systems could be used by law schools contemplating a complete overhaul of their curriculum. Instead of going it alone, they could work with other schools in developing courses and course materials. Again, schools could share in a national or even international deliberative process while ultimately retaining their independence.

One potential institutional development could be nationwide “open access centers” devoted to certain elements of the curriculum. For example, an Open Access Center for the Study of Contracts could serve as a national repository for Contracts courses. The Center could run an open access Contracts casebook. It could host conferences (live and virtual) about the content of Contracts courses. It could work with the ABA and state bar associations to coordinate subject coverage. Perhaps the Center would focus on developing more transactional skills courses, or would focus on bringing more statutory law into Contracts courses. There need not be only one – different schools could host Contracts centers with different ideological or pedagogical foci. But professors could participate on a national level, and open access would insure that the participation remained free with low transaction costs.

Advances in technology will change the very nature of legal education. In the Fromkin “nightmare” scenario, technology wipes out the vast majority of law school faculty and replaces them with a small collection of teaching stars and the elite institutions that support and manage them. This top-down approach would consolidate the provision of legal education and depersonalize the law school experience. Technology need not have these effects. An open access approach would leverage technology to allow for levels of feedback and collaboration previously impossible. But professors must still be there to provide the feedback and collaborate on the curriculum. In my view, this grass-roots approach is far more preferable to a system in which education is imposed from above, rather than developed from within.

Conclusion

The open access movement is about breaking down barriers to information so as to free up opportunities for greater insight and collaboration. While the movement has focused primarily on academic scholarship, open access principles could facilitate the transformation of legal education. An open access approach would mean new pools of course materials for professors to draw on, new means of interaction and collaboration between professors and students, and new possibilities for restructuring the law school curriculum. To be certain, an open access approach will take resources and institutional support, and existing educational and commercial institutions will try to retain their control. But by starting now to create an open access approach, we stand the best chance of allowing for the incredible growth that new technologies could engender.